

REMARKS

In this paper, claim 1 is currently amended. After entry of the above amendment, claims 1-27 are pending.

The applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 6, 8-20 and 22-27

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Takeuchi, et al (US 5,351,185). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a programmed computer that is programmed to control a controlled bicycle device; and a reset circuit that receives information related to a traveling condition of the bicycle and provides a reset signal to the computer to reset the computer in response to the occurrence of a predetermined traveling condition of the bicycle. Takeuchi, et al discloses a microcomputer (30) that is programmed to control the operation of an automobile safety device such as an airbag, and none of the parameters used by microcomputer (30) can fairly be called a traveling condition of a bicycle. Thus, Takeuchi, et al neither discloses nor suggests the subject matter recited in claim 1.

As for claim 2, Taekuchi, et al clearly does not operate with any parameter that could be called a bicycle speed.

Claims 3 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi, et al in view of Takata (US 5,226,501). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Takata discloses an electric-motored bicycle wherein a controller (33) controls the power supply to a motor (31). A normally-open switch (39) connects controller (33) to motor (31), wherein switch (39) is controlled by a self-holding circuit (42) disposed within a reverse control circuit (41). Self-holding circuit (42) is set by signals from a torque comparator (43) to close switch (39) when torque applied to the bicycle transmission exceeds a particular value. Self-holding circuit (42) is reset by signals from a speed comparator (44) to open switch (39) when the speed of the bicycle falls below a predetermined value. One of ordinary skill in the art will readily recognize self-holding circuit to be a flip-flop or some other bistable device and not a computer. Thus, Takata neither

discloses nor suggests providing a reset signal to a computer to reset the computer in response to the occurrence of a predetermined traveling condition.

Claims 4-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi, et al in view of Ikuma (US 4,364,448). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ikuma discloses a bicycle wherein pedaling is assisted by an internal combustion engine (23) that includes a carburetor (28) with a throttle valve (35) controlled by a stepping motor (31). Column 7, lines 20-59 referenced in the office action describes a timing unit (49, 50, 51, 53, 54) that provides pulses to the adding input of a counter (55). Counter (55) counts upward in response to the signals from OR gate (54). Counter (55) also includes a subtraction input (55a), wherein counter (55) counts down in response to signals received at the subtraction input (55a). The counting direction of counter (55) is used to determine the rotational direction of stepping motor (55). None of these signals are used to reset a programmed computer. Column 10, lines 1-28 referenced in the office action describes a circuit that provides pulses corresponding to engine speed. Nothing described therein is directed to using any of the pulses to reset a programmed computer. Column 11, lines 1-28 referenced in the office action describes a circuit that detects when the engine is running so that counter (55) counts up to provide a signal to move stepping motor (31) in a direction to open throttle valve (35). Nothing described therein is directed to using any of the pulses to reset a programmed computer. The only resetting described is related to resetting throttle valve (35) to a fully open position, and throttle valve (35) is not a programmed computer.

As for claim 7, column 15, line 66 through column 16, line 34 discusses how a wheel sensor (315) may be used instead of the engine pulses to control stepping motor (31). However, as noted above, none of these signals are used to reset a programmed computer.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 have been overcome by the foregoing amendment and remarks, and it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

KOUJI UNO
Application No.: 10/707,176
Page 10

PATENT

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Deland
Reg. No. 31,242

DELAND LAW OFFICE
P.O. Box 69
Klamath River, California 96050
(530) 465-2430